

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/606,460	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOSHI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Katherine A. Bareford	<b>Art Unit</b> 1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine A. Bareford. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (2) Thomas Adams. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant  
 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 28 plus.

Identification of prior art discussed: Heydu, etc.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

KATHERINE BAREFORD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner discussed possibility of showing unexpected benefits for scope of claimed range, such as the range of 4.5-5.5 pH, with showings just inside and outside the range. Noted that only a single point not immediately outside the claimed range was provided by applicant as to the Japan '864 reference. Also discussed issue of the many brighteners used in electroplating, and the empirical usage needed to determine if they will work. The Examiner noted that the comparison is to brighteners such as in Haydu that are expected to work and whether the structural similarity is such that the mercapto substituted inhibitor claimed would be expected to work. Also discussed the possibility that the pH of the zincating baths described in Haydu would affect the brightener use. Also discussed the possibility of showing unexpected benefits over other similar brighteners/inhibitors that are not the same as the claimed inhibitor. The Examiner noted that showings as to these issues in the form of declarations may not be entered after final...